

SOCIETY GOSSIPS BELIEVE LOVELY ELSA PORTNER FINALLY WED MAN SHE LEFT AT CHURCH WHEN SHE ELOPED WITH OFFICER

DASHING LIEUTENANT ASKED HALF MILLION OF EX-WIFE'S HUSBAND

Then He in Turn Is Sued by Michael Glennan, Norfolk Contractor and Banker, Whose Pretty Wife Is Charged With Mixing Highballs for Him at Her Home—Testimony in First Trial Was Voluminous.

WHEN the beautiful Elsa Portner, one of the famous Portner belles and heir to the Virginia brewer's millions, eloped with Lorimer C. Graham ten years ago, was the man she left waiting at the church, and with whom her family and friends planned a "brilliant match," Augustin Leftwich Humes, wealthy New York Lawyer?

Washington society seems to have found the answer at last in the \$500,000 suit brought by Graham against Humes for alienation of his wife's affections, heard in District of Columbia Supreme Court.

"Elsa Portner's elopement with Graham was rather a disappointment to her friends in Washington society. These had expected her to marry a New York millionaire who had been a persistent suitor for her hand."

This comment ten years ago created a social mystery after the elopement of Miss Portner, beautiful Washington debutante and friend of Miss Helen Taft, with Lorimer C. Graham, young, wealthy, and attractive.

Mrs. Graham is now Mrs. Humes, having divorced the former naval officer in Reno and married the New York man on April 2, 1921.

Graham in his suit accused Humes of alienating the affections of the then Mrs. Portner-Graham. The complaint recites a tale of romance beginning before the youngest of the Portner belles secretly married young Graham in Baltimore on March 22, 1911.

Mr. Graham swears he and his wife lived happily until June 5, 1917, when he entered the navy as an ensign and was assigned to duty at the Brooklyn navy yard. Two daughters, now seven and four years old, respectively, were born to the Grahams.

Graham has testified to friendship between Humes and Mrs. Graham before the latter's marriage. The fact that Miss Portner had become Mrs. Graham did not cool the ardor of Humes, according to Graham.

While he was on duty in Brooklyn, Graham asserts, Humes paid devoted court to Mrs. Graham, showering her with flowers, works of art, costly gems and other articles of personal adornment. Specifically mentioned are a gold cigarette case set with diamonds and a diamond bracelet.

SUES FOR HEART BALM.

The "heart balm" suit opened Nov. 23. It was one of their two children, Lieutenant Graham testified, who informed him of Mrs. Graham's alleged relations with Mr. Humes. He said that he was with his family at Spring Lake, N. J., during the summer of 1917.

He took the children with him to the store, he said, when one of them said "Hello" to Mr. Humes. He had never seen Humes before, the naval officer testified. When he upbraided the child for speaking to a stranger, Lieutenant Graham said, the child replied:

"Why that man is around the house all the time—I know him."

The beautiful Mrs. Humes denied the allegations of her former husband.

"It is cruel and unjust for anyone to say that Mr. Humes had anything to do with my divorce from Mr. Graham."

Cruelty, she says, cooled her love toward Graham. She would have brought the suit if she had never seen Humes, the former Washington belle declared.

"I am, of course, greatly surprised that Mr. Graham should have brought this unfounded suit against my husband, and that he should have made such false statements against me and the facts connected with my divorce from him."

WIFE'S DENIAL.

"I do not understand how Mr. Graham could possibly say he did not know I was going to sue for a divorce until he was informed of it by a friend in New York. I wrote him early in October, more than two months before my suit was filed, that I had definitely decided upon this course. He was also served personally with a notice."

Just before the trial Mr. Graham came to see me and talked with me, but neither then nor at the trial did he claim any of the things he states in his suit against Mr. Humes.

"He employed a lawyer, but the case against him was so strong and clear that the judge granted me the divorce."

"At the trial Mr. Graham, through his lawyer, did not deny my charges, though his lawyer was present in

court all during the trial and cross-examined.

"I had known Mr. Humes for years. After my divorce I did marry him, but it is cruel and unjust for anyone to say Mr. Humes had anything to do with my divorce."

"My family, familiar with his neglect and cruel conduct, fully approved my course."

"The fact that Mr. Graham was an officer in the paymaster corps of the navy did not necessitate his separation from his family. He could easily have taken us to Norfolk, Va., or Brooklyn, N. Y., where he was stationed."

GAY PARTIES DESCRIBED.

Lieutenant Graham was a frequent visitor at the home of Mrs. Michael Glennan, at Norfolk, Va., when her banker husband was away at work, housemaids testified at the hearing of Graham's \$500,000 love suit against Humes.

Ida Armstrong told the court that preparations for a gay party were made when Lieutenant Graham was expected, and that Mrs. Glennan always sent her out of the house with the Glennan children while the naval officer was there.

Depositions of other maids in the Glennan home, read in court by attorneys for Mr. Humes and for Mrs. Elsa Portner Graham-Humes, whose love the New York attorney is alleged to have alienated, described in detail some of Lieutenant Graham's visits.

Mrs. Glennan ordered ice for highballs before each of the naval officer's visits, the court was informed. The visits always occurred during the daytime, the housemaids said, when Mr. Glennan was at his office.

All the servants testified that whenever Lieutenant Graham called at the Glennan home they were sent out on errands so that the lieutenant and Mrs. Glennan were left alone.

A broken-down automobile which Lieutenant Graham testified forced him to spend the night of July 6, 1918, at the Princeton (N. J.) home of Mrs. Glennan's parents was declared to be a myth by Ida Armstrong.

Instead of the machine being broken down, the maid testified, the naval officer drove up to the door in it and later took Mrs. Glennan for a ride. The maid said she did not know what time they returned.

Mr. and Mrs. Howe, the parents of Mrs. Glennan, were away from home at the time, Miss Armstrong said. She said that before Lieutenant Graham arrived Mrs. Glennan instructed her to prepare an especially good dinner.

The maid told the court that Lieutenant Graham slept in a guest room adjoining that of Mrs. Glennan.

Graham is being sued for \$50,000 by Glennan for alienating Mrs. Glennan's affections. Attorney Wilton J. Lambert for Humes says he tried to show that Graham married Elsa Portner for her money, that he was without funds at the time but that as soon as he obtained her money his cruelty began.

TESTIMONY OF MAID.

Depositions from former Secretary of the Treasury William G. McAdoo and Congressman Henry D. Flood, of Virginia, who dined Thursday, offered at the trial. The McAdoo

moment in any day in any year along the axis of the temple, since about 6000 B. C., and that it last set along the central line of this axis between 12,000 and 13,000 years ago. At this date Europe was still in the Old Stone Age; the cave period was at its zenith and the hunters of the Dordogne were chasing reindeer over the French tundras. To suppose that the Temple of Karnak can have been built then is obviously absurd.

There were always people who can imagine anything about ancient temples. There was once a man who wrote a book, to prove that Stonehenge was built by Adam to commemorate the Fall. There will still be people who will maintain



MRS. AGUSTUS L. HUMES.

deposition submitted on behalf of Humes was not admitted because of objection by the lawyers for Graham. The Flood deposition, however, was admitted. It set forth that Lieutenant Graham did not deny his relations with Mrs. Glennan.

Mr. Flood also swore that Elsa Portner Graham Humes told him she was convinced that Graham had been on intimate relations with Mrs. Glennan at Norfolk and at Princeton, N. J. That was prior to the date when she went to Reno to institute her divorce proceedings.

Mrs. Hilda Jortner Derby, another witness for the defense, testified that the young lieutenant was continually "nagging" his wife because of household expenses and that he upbraided her when she spent her own money for clothing and other expenses.

In the closing hours of the trial Attorney Daniel Thew Wright introduced evidence tending to damage testimony against his client given by one Ida Armstrong, a domestic. Attorney Wright put on the stand Edward L. Howe, of Princeton, stepfather of Mrs. Glennan.

Mr. Howe testified that Ida Armstrong, the maid who testified that Graham spent the night of July 6, 1918, at the Princeton home of Mr. Howe while he and his wife were away, was not employed by him at the time.

Asked by Attorney Lambert if the maid had ever been in the house after that time, Mr. Howe, with some heat, replied:

"She might have been there with some thieves in 1919, when I was not there." The answer was ruled out by the court.

An architect's map showing the Princeton home of Mr. Howe was displayed by Attorney Wright, and the witness explained the locations of the various rooms in the house.

Emphatic denials of most of the testimony introduced by witnesses for the defense were made by

FIGURES IN \$500,000 LOVE BALM SUIT



MRS. MICHAEL GLENNAN.

LORIMER C. GRAHAM



CONGRESSMAN HENRY D. FLOOD.



MRS. HILDA DERBY

Lieut. Graham, at one of the closing sessions of the trial.

Graham denied he ever admitted to Congressman Flood improper relations with Mrs. Glennan.

He denied ever making the statement to Congressman Flood that he could obtain \$75,000 from Humes in an alienation suit.

He denied he ever took dinner with Mrs. Glennan on the roof garden of a Brooklyn hotel, as testified

by one of the head waiters of the hotel.

He said he had never drunk high balls with Mrs. Glennan in her home in Norfolk, and that he had never had dinner with her except in her Norfolk home when her husband was present.

Graham denied testimony of witnesses from Reno, who said that during a conversation with his wife she referred to him as "a loafer and a nagger, and that she had reason to suspect his fidelity."

He denied his wife ever said, "You have never treated me like a husband should; you have always been with other women."

Testimony that little Michael Glennan, the five-year-old child of Mrs. Glennan called Graham by his first name, when he visited the home of her parents in Princeton, N. J., in July, 1918, was brought out by Mary Cox, a witness for Graham, who was employed in the Prince-

ton home for a short time. Mrs. Cox was called as a witness in rebuttal of the testimony of Ida Armstrong, the colored maid.

Mrs. Cox testified that she did not know the Armstrong woman and that she was not employed there at the time alleged. She said that she answered the door when Graham called on the evening in question, and after he walked into the home he was greeted by the Glennan child who called him "Lorimer."

Attorney Wright sprang a surprise when he called William E. Mattingly, a private detective, as a witness. Mattingly admitted he had been engaged to shadow Graham and his counsel and on one occasion detailed a female detective to follow Judge Wright in New York.

Judge Wright also introduced as

ton home for a short time.

Mrs. Cox was called as a witness in rebuttal of the testimony of Ida Armstrong, the colored maid.

Mrs. Cox testified that she did not know the Armstrong woman and that she was not employed there at the time alleged. She said that she answered the door when Graham called on the evening in question, and after he walked into the home he was greeted by the Glennan child who called him "Lorimer."

Attorney Wright sprang a surprise when he called William E. Mattingly, a private detective, as a witness. Mattingly admitted he had been engaged to shadow Graham and his counsel and on one occasion detailed a female detective to follow Judge Wright in New York.

Judge Wright also introduced as

ROMANCE BEGUN IN MARCH '11

a witness Anderson Mitnaul, colored, formerly employed by the stepfather of Mrs. Glennan. He testified he met a lawyer in Washington by the name of Banks about a year-and-a-half ago who asked him if he ever remembered seeing Graham with Mrs. Glennan at Princeton. He identified Wilton J. Lambert, counsel for Humes, as the lawyer whom he met by the name of Banks.

Dr. Edward S. Hawk, of Princeton, N. J., who attended Mrs. Glennan at the birth of her last child, gave testimony refuting the statements made by the Armstrong woman.

CHAMPAGNE PARTY.

Details of a gay party at the Plaza, in New York, on armistice night, 1918, were related to the jury by Graham during the course of the trial. He declared that the two women in the party were the Guggenheims, wives of the "copper kings," and that they put up the money for the quantities of champagne drunk during the course of the celebration marking the end of the war.

The night did not mark the end of hostilities for Graham, however, for the man who joined him at the party, the naval lieutenant declared, was the brother of the same Norfolk banker that is now suing him for alienation of Mrs. Glennan's affections.

Graham stated that he was invited to the champagne function by the millionaires' wives, who at that time were occupying a whole floor at New York's "ultra" hotel, the St. Regis. "They told us they used their suite as a resting place in the afternoon," Graham smilingly announced.

William Glennan, brother of the Michael Glennan who claims Graham won his wife away from him, swore in a deposition that he met the dashing young officer on armistice night. He said the officer showed him a bottle of champagne which he had concealed under his coat.

"I have two women and need another man," Glennan swears that Graham said to him.

He further stated that he joined the party at the Plaza, but as the night progressed "things began to get rough" and the party adjourned to the rose room of the hotel.

Another millionaire's name was brought into the trial when Graham identified the mysterious "red haired" woman who called him "Lorrie" as Mrs. Armstrong, a sister of Mrs. H. S. Harkness, wife of the Standard Oil magnate.

Ceremony In Chapel Where English King Was 'Church Warden'

A KING as church warden! How many parishes in England can claim the honor of having enlisted the sovereign as the "right hand" of the vicar? At the moment there comes to my mind only one—that of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, Trafalgar square. Everybody knows St. Martin's; that is, every Londoner. A central landmark, the church is famous for its links with the past and its contributions to the activities of today.

Just now St. Martin's is especially prominent. The present structure has completed two centuries of existence. During the week, November 6-13, there were festival services. Armistice Day (November 11) was, in fact, St. Martin's Day, and on that occasion, when national sentiment centered in the Cenotaph, a meeting to take the form of a "solemn act of remembrance" was held in connection with St. Martin's at the Central Hall, Westminster, followed by the usual procession through Trafalgar square and a service at the church in the evening.

King George I. (then in the eighth year of his reign) laid by deputy—Richard Bishop of Salisbury, high almoner—the foundation stone of the church on March 19, 1731.

Although the King was represented by deputy on this occasion, his interest in the new building was actively personal, since he assumed the office of church warden—an act on the part of the sovereign to which it would be difficult to find a parallel. His majesty, apparently found the office too onerous, since his retention of the wardenship was limited to a few months. He made amends for his retirement, however, by presenting St. Martin's with an organ, costing 1,500 guineas, and made famous by the fact that Handel frequently played voluntaries on Sunday afternoon.

Three years after the foundation stone had been laid, there occurred the execution at Tyburn of Jack Sheppard, the notorious highwayman. A final resting place for Jack was found in St. Martin's church—also are buried the famous Chippendale and his wife, the father of Beattie Brummell, John Lubbock, father of the son "Ray of Biscay," and others.

KARNAK SUN-WORSHIP THEORY IS EXPLODED BY BRILLIANT SCIENTIST

A THEORY of the late Sir Norman Lockyer has just received a blow from which it can hardly recover, says a scientific correspondent of the London Times. Accurate measurements made by the Egyptian Survey have proved that never since the great Temple of Karnak was built has the sun shone straight down its axis. Sir Norman Lockyer believed that this temple and many others in addition were constructed for the purpose of obtaining an exact observation of the precise time of the solstice—that is to say, the day of the sun's most northerly setting.

But Mr. Richards, of the Survey of Egypt, has proved that the sun has never been visible at all, at any

Accurate Measurements by Britain's Egyptian Survey Reveal That Never Since Ancient Temple Was Built Has the Sun Shone Straight Down Its Axis, as Scientists and Astronomers Once Believed.

that Stonehenge is an accurate prehistoric observatory, even should the necessary data prove earlier than that of the Pitdown Man. Unfortunately astronomy is not likely to help us to prove the date. It would hardly be profitable to carry out precise observations with

this stone does not stand, as is often supposed, in the central axis of the avenue. What, again, is to be taken as the center of the stone circles themselves?

A difference of two feet—no more than one—could move one's head without shifting one's position—would neutralize the whole amount of change in the emergency of the sun above the horizon since 2,000 B. C.

The idea of dating the construction of these temples by means of astronomical observations was suggested by the gradual change in the point of sunrise and sunset. At Karnak the point on the horizon but by the setting sun is gradually shifting southward.

This change, however, is extremely slow, and during the last 4,000 years the sun has moved southward by an amount only equal to his own diameter. The exact age of Stonehenge is still undiscovered, but no archaeologist would put it before 2,000 B. C. Even supposing it to have been put up for the purpose of making observations of the sunrise, we could not, on account of the roughness of the data, discover the date by astronomical means.

The work of Mr. Richards at Karnak would appear to dispose finally of the sun-temple hypothesis; and the Survey of Egypt is to be heartily congratulated upon the accomplishment of a most useful piece of work.